

BIPYRAMID DECOMPOSITIONS OF MULTI-CROSSING LINK COMPLEMENTS

COLIN ADAMS AND GREGORY KEHNE

ABSTRACT. Generalizing previous constructions, we present a dual pair of decompositions of the complement of a link L into bipyramids, given any multi-crossing projection of L . When L is hyperbolic, this gives new upper bounds on the volume of L given its multi-crossing projection. These bounds are realized by three closely related infinite tiling weaves.

1. INTRODUCTION

The standard planar projections of links embedded in S^3 are *2-crossing projections*, which means that strands only cross one another two at a time in the projection—or equivalently, that the vertices v of the projection graph G all have degree $d(v) = 4$. More recently, 2-crossing link projections have been generalized to *n -crossing projections*, which are projections of a link in which the strands cross one another n at a time, or equivalently, the vertices in G have degree $2n$, as in Figure 1(A).

Every link has a projection consisting solely of n -crossings for every $n \geq 2$, and many of the ideas that apply to 2-crossing projections can be generalized to n -crossing projections. See for instance [1], [2], and [3]. These projections can be further generalized to *multi-crossing projections*, where crossings of different multiplicities are permitted within a projection and the vertices of G need only be of even degree.


These include link projections that consist of a lone multi-crossing, which are called *übercrossing projections*. When the size of the multi-crossing is odd and each strand s_i connects to s_{i-1} or s_{i+1} , they are called *petal projections* of a knot. Petal knot projections and übercrossing projections were shown to exist for any knot and link (respectively) in [6], and further studied in [5] and [8].

When referencing an n -crossing c in a projection of a link, it will be useful to refer in a standard way to the strands $s_1, \dots, s_n$ and the levels $l_1, \dots, l_n$ at which the strands pass through the n -crossing. These labels are shown in Figure 1(A). Throughout we refer to the levels of adjacent strands l_i, l_{i+1} or the strands corresponding to adjacent levels s_i, s_{i+1} ; the ‘wraparound cases’ l_n, l_1 and s_n, s_1 are implied. We keep track of a particular multi-crossing by noting the permutation $l_1, \dots, l_n$ obtained by considering the levels of its strands clockwise from above, starting on the top strand.


Multi-crossing knot diagrams

By work of W. Thurston [12], the complements of many knots and links admit a hyperbolic metric, and when this is the case, the Mostow/Prasad Rigidity Theorem says the metric is uniquely determined. This implies that geometric invariants of a link complement coming from its hyperbolic metric are topological invariants of the link. The *hyperbolic volume* of a link, defined to be $\text{vol}(L) = \text{vol}(S^3 \setminus L)$, is

Date: October 13, 2016.



(A) A general multi-crossing c of size n , with strands and associated strand levels labelled.



(B) The specific multi-crossing 13524 in an übercrossing projection of the figure-eight knot.


FIGURE 1. Multi-crossings are represented by their strands and the levels at which the strands enter the crossing. The levels of the strands give a permutation on n elements that encodes the multi-crossing.

particularly discerning when it comes to distinguishing among hyperbolic knots and links. Additionally, it offers a good measure of the complexity of a link.

As hyperbolic 3-manifolds, the complements of links produce polyhedral fundamental domains in the universal covering space $\mathbb{H}^3$, where the components of the link correspond to collections of *ideal points* on $\partial\mathbb{H}^3$ “at infinity”. The corresponding decompositions of the manifold $S^3 \setminus L$ into hyperbolic polyhedra contain ideal vertices and edges that extend to them. Decompositions can also contain *finite vertices*, which correspond to points in the interior of the link complement. For any such combinatorial polyhedron P , there is an upper bound on the hyperbolic volume $\text{vol}(P)$ in $\mathbb{H}^3$ that holds across all embeddings of P in $\mathbb{H}^3$ with geodesic faces and edges. We will make special use of the maximal hyperbolic volumes across all tetrahedra and all octahedra, which are $v_{tet} \approx 1.0149$ and $v_{oct} \approx 3.6639$ respectively, and are realized by ideal regular polyhedra.

Since each polyhedron has a maximum achievable volume when embedded in $\mathbb{H}^3$, a decomposition of a link complement into combinatorial polyhedra provides an upper bound on the volume of the link.

D. Thurston showed that given a 2-crossing projection P of a link L , the complement $S^3 \setminus L$ can be constructed by placing an octahedron at each crossing, where each octahedron’s top and bottom vertices are ideal points in the cusps of the upper and lower strands of its crossing, as in Figure 2(A). The equatorial vertices of the octahedron are pulled up and down to finite vertices u and d , which sit above and below the projection plane in the complement of the link. The edges extending from the ideal top and bottom vertices of the octahedra become “vertical” semi-finite edges from u or d to the cusps after gluing, and the finite equatorial edges of the octahedra



(A) The crossing-centered octahedron (B) The octahedron is split into tetrahedra

FIGURE 2. The first steps in rearranging the 2-crossing-centered octahedral decomposition to form face-centered bipyramid decomposition.

become “vertical” edges between u and d that pass through each face in the projection. The faces of the crossing-centered octahedra glue to the faces of the octahedra at adjacent crossings on the strand, and they together form a decomposition of the link complement into octahedra. This gives an upper bound of

$$\text{vol}(L) \leq c(L)v_{oct}$$

where $c(L)$ is the crossing number.

This decomposition and associated bound have been widely used and modified, as in [9], [10], and [11]. These bounds and others are described in [4], where these octahedra are each cut into four tetrahedra, then recombined about the finite “vertical” edges that pass through the faces in the projection plane. The tetrahedra glue about these edges to form *face-centered bipyramids*, with finite top and bottom vertices at u and d and ideal equatorial vertices corresponding to the cusps. The division of the octahedra is shown in Figure 2(B). For a given 2-crossing projection the face-centered bipyramid decomposition offers a more stringent upper bound on the volume of a link than the octahedral decomposition, because the volume of a maximum-size hyperbolic bipyramid grows logarithmically with the number of tetrahedra that compose it. The volume bound derived from this face-centered bipyramid decomposition is referred to as the FCB bound.

In Section 2, given any multi-crossing projection of L , we develop a dual pair of bipyramid decompositions of the complement of L . These are the multi-crossing generalizations of the 2-crossing projection decompositions into octahedra at the crossings and into face-centered bipyramids described above.

In Section 3, we consider upper bounds on hyperbolic volume that these decompositions yield in the case when L is hyperbolic. In a subsequent paper, a more in depth analysis of the resulting volume bounds will appear.

In Section 4, we apply these upper bounds, together with properties of the infinite square weave, in order to establish two new planar tiling weaves that contain multi-crossings. These are the *triple weave*, consisting of 3-crossings, and the *right triangle weave*, consisting of 2- and 4-crossings. Like the square weave, the triple weave and the right triangle weave realize the maximum possible volume per crossing in any link with these types of crossings. Somewhat surprisingly, the complement manifolds of the minimal finite representations of these three weaves in a thickened torus are homeomorphic to one another.

2. THE CONSTRUCTION

We first develop the *face-centered bipyramid decomposition*, which holds for all multi-crossing projections of links. The face-centered bipyramids in this decomposition have finite top and bottom vertices and ideal equatorial vertices. We then demonstrate how, as in the 2-crossing case, these face-centered bipyramids can be cut into tetrahedra and rearranged into a dual decomposition of the complement into crossing-centered bipyramids.

2.1. Face-Centered Bipyramid Construction. We begin with a multi-crossing diagram P of a link L , a portion of which is shown in Figure 3(A). This consists of multi-crossings $c \in C$, where $n(c)$ strand segments $s_1, \dots, s_{n(c)}$ come together at levels $l_1, \dots, l_{n(c)}$. In graph-theoretic terms, P is a projection of a planar graph with even-degree vertices and possible reflexive edges and multi-edges, along with permutations describing the configuration of each crossing. The faces of P are the faces of the projection graph, and their boundaries are described by sequences of alternating strands and crossings, where each strand has an associated level in each of the two crossings that it connects.

To decompose the complement of the link, first introduce two finite vertices, u and d , positioned above and below the projection plane. Next, superimpose the unique dual graph G^* over P , as shown in Figure 3(B), with a vertex in every face of P and an edge lying perpendicular to each strand in P . The faces of G^* each contain a unique multi-crossing of P in a standard configuration, where each strand segment leaving a crossing c in P intersects a unique edge in the face in G^* corresponding to c .

Next, cone the vertices and edges of G^* upwards and downwards out of the projection plane to the finite points u and d , as in Figure 3(B). The vertices of G^* corresponding to each face of P cone to edges in $S^3 \setminus L$ that pass from d to u . The edges of G^* extend to faces in $S^3 \setminus L$ that are each punctured by a strand in P . Now introduce semi-finite edges from the cusps at these punctures up and down to the u and d vertices, so that each of these punctured faces is split into two triangular faces in $S^3 \setminus L$, with finite vertices u and d and an ideal vertex corresponding to the cusp. These are shown in dark blue and green in Figure 3(C). This is a preliminary decomposition of $S^3 \setminus L$ into a set of skewed bipyramids $\{R_c\}$ that glue up in a well-behaved manner, such that each region R_c contains exactly one of the multi-crossings c of P . We now describe a further decomposition of each such region, which will extend to a decomposition of all of $S^3 \setminus L$.

Each face of G^* is partitioned by the projections of the strands $s_1, \dots, s_{n(c)}$ of the crossing c that it contains. Each of these sections $T_1, \dots, T_{2n(c)}$ is bordered by adjacent




FIGURE 3. The face-centered bipyramid decomposition.

strands s_i and s_{i+1} , which traverse c at levels l_i and l_{i+1} . In order to decompose them further, introduce a sequence of vertical edges in the centers of the skewed bipyramids that extend between u and the top strand, between each pair of adjacent strands, and between the bottom strand and d , as in Figure 3(D).

Let an m -wedge denote the polyhedron composed of m tetrahedra that share a common edge, where each is glued to the next on a face that this edge borders. The m -wedge can be obtained by ungluing one radial face between two of the adjacent tetrahedra sharing the central edge in an m -bipyramid. R_c decomposes into a collection of $|l_{i+1} - l_i|$ -wedges, as shown in Figures 3(D) and 3(E), with its central edge taken to be the edge from u to d on the boundary of R_c between strands s_i and s_{i+1} , shown in light blue in Figure 3(D). The top and bottom vertices of this wedge are u and d , and the equatorial vertices are ideal vertices that correspond to the strands in c at levels $l_i, \dots, l_{i+1}$ sequentially. These wedges lie in R_c in a well-behaved fashion, such that the edges between the finite vertices and the cusps remain above or below the projection plane. A triangular face on the top side of a wedge in section T_x will have vertices u , s_j , and s_k , where s_j and s_k are ideal points that touch the strands of c at adjacent levels l_j , $l_j + 1$ or l_j , l_{j-1} . It will glue to a triangular face with vertices u , s_k , and s_j on the top side of the wedge T_y that lies in the next section of R_c such that if the strands bordering T_y are l_1 and l_2 , $l_1 < l_2$, then $l_1 \leq l_i$ and $l_{i+1} \leq l_2$. The vertex and edge labels of these triangular faces align such that they glue to one another, because if the levels of the strands s_i , s_{i+1} that border the first section of R_c are such that $l_i < l_{i+1}$, then for the next adjacent pair s_m , s_{m+1} with associated levels l_m , l_{m+1} it is necessarily the case that $l_m > l_{m+1}$. Therefore all of the top faces of a wedge will glue to the top faces of other wedges in other sections of R_c , and these gluings will occur between the strands at each level in the multi-crossing. There are analogous gluings for the lower faces of the wedges about c .

This shows that given a link L and a multi-crossing projection P of L , the complement $S^3 \setminus L$ can be decomposed into skewed bipyramids $\{R_c\}$, one for each multi-crossing. Each of these skewed bipyramids can be further decomposed into wedges of tetrahedra that join with the wedges from the skewed bipyramids around the neighboring multi-crossings to form bipyramids that sit in the faces of the projection, one of which is shown in Figure 3(F). This is summarized in the following theorem:

Theorem 1. *Given a multi-crossing projection P of a link L with faces $f \in F$, with each boundary denoted $\partial f = s_1, c_1, \dots, s_m, c_m$, the complement of the link can be decomposed into a collection of bipyramids $\{B_f\}$, one associated with each face, where the size of each is determined by*

$$(1) \quad |B_f| = \sum_{c_i \in \partial f} |l(s_i, c_i) - l(s_{i+1}, c_i)|,$$

where $l(s, c)$ denotes the level at which strand s enters crossing c .

Note that in general a face-centered bipyramid does not consist of as many tetrahedra as there are edges bounding the face, as is the case for the face-centered bipyramids derived from 2-crossing projections.




FIGURE 4. The six 4-crossing configurations, identified up to reflection, and their crossing-centered bipyramid decompositions.

2.2. Crossing-Centered Bipyramid Construction. From the face-centered decomposition we derive the dual *crossing-centered bipyramid decomposition* by regrouping the tetrahedra within the wedges according to which of the two adjacent level strands of the multi-crossing they touch. Each collection of tetrahedra that glue to one another at a single level in the multi-crossing forms a bipyramid, gluing face-to-face about a common edge, which is the edge running between the cusps of the adjacent strands. The size of the crossing-centered bipyramid between strands i and $i + 1$ of a multi-crossing is determined by the number of faces neighboring c that contribute tetrahedra to it. This is because, in the construction above, each adjacent pair of strands in c contributes exactly one tetrahedron to the wedge that c contributes to a face-centered bipyramid.

Theorem 2. *If c is a multi-crossing composed of the strands $s_1, \dots, s_j, \dots, s_n$ at crossing levels $l_1, \dots, l_j, \dots, l_n$, then the number of equatorial edges of the crossing-centered bipyramid $B_{c,i}$ between the strands at level i and level $i + 1$ in c is given by*

$$(2) \quad M(c, i) = 2 |\{j : \min\{l_j, l_{j+1}\} < i + 1/2 < \max\{l_j, l_{j+1}\}\}|$$

Moreover, $M(c, i)$ is a multiple of 4.

Proof. The crossing-centered bipyramid in question can be viewed as a collection of $M(c, i)$ tetrahedra that share the bipyramid's central edge and glue face-to-face around it. Each of these tetrahedra is contributed by exactly one face-centered bipyramid B_f , where the vertex $v \in V(G(L))$ that corresponds to c is on the boundary of the face $f \in F(G(L))$ associated with this face-centered bipyramid. Each strand of c corresponds to two edges in $E(G(L))$. So if the strands $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n$ that compose c project to the $2n$ edges $\{u_1, v\}, \{u_2, v\}, \dots, \{u_n, v\}, \{u_{n+1}, v\}, \{u_{n+2}, v\}, \dots, \{u_{2n}, v\}$, then for each face f with sequential boundary edges $\dots, \{u_k, v\}, \{u_{k+1}, v\}, \dots$ (or, in the wraparound case, $\dots, \{u_{2n}, v\}, \{u_1, v\}, \dots$), B_f contributes a tetrahedron to $B_{c,i}$ if and only if B_f contains a tetrahedron that glues face-to-face with tetrahedra of the face-centered bipyramids neighboring it across the strands at level i and level $i+1$ in P . This is the case when the interval $(i, i+1)$ lies within interval formed by levels l_k and l_{k+1} corresponding to u_k and u_{k+1} . In fact, B_f contains $|l_k - l_{k+1}|$ tetrahedra that glue to the tetrahedra of neighboring face-centered bipyramids at c , but only one of these tetrahedra has ideal vertices on the strands at levels i and $i+1$.

As the $2n$ faces between the strands of the crossing and their corresponding intervals $(l_k - l_{k+1})$ are considered in turn, there are two observations. First, any $(i, i+1)$ is necessarily contained within an even number of the intervals $(l_0, l_1), \dots, (l_{n-1}, l_0)$, because as the sequence of strand level intervals is traversed, it eventually returns to the top level. Therefore the first n adjacent faces contribute an even number of tetrahedra to the crossing-centered bipyramid $B_{c,i}$. Additionally, the second set of n faces and corresponding intervals are identical to the first, because c has twofold rotational symmetry by virtue of each strand passing straight through c and exiting at the same level at which it entered. Therefore the number of tetrahedra that compose $B_{c,i}$ can be determined by counting the number of gaps between levels around c that span $(i, i+1)$ and multiplying by 2, and for each $B_{c,i}$ this will be a multiple of 4. $\square$

It follows that in any multi-crossing c , the first and last crossing-centered bipyramids $B_{c,1}$ and $B_{c,n(c)-1}$ are octahedra. For $B_{c,1}$, this is because the top strand s_i with $l_i = 1$ is the only one that can border any interval that contains $(1, 2)$, and it does so for the two faces to either side of it before traversing c , and for the faces on either side of it after it traverses c . Therefore $B_{c,1}$ is composed of 4 tetrahedra glued face-to-face and sharing a common edge, and it is therefore an octahedron. The bottom bipyramid $B_{c,n(c)-1}$ is an octahedron for the same reason. However the other crossing-centered bipyramid sizes in an n -crossing can vary depending on the configuration of the n -crossing. In Figure 4, we see the bipyramid possibilities for the 4-crossings (three cases up to reflection), including the first example of a non-octahedral crossing centered decomposition as in Figure 4(C).

Corollary 3. *Within a multi-crossing c , the sizes of adjacent crossing-centered bipyramids must satisfy*

$$|M(c, i) - M(c, i+1)| = 0 \text{ or } 4$$

Proof. Within c , the sizes of two adjacent crossing-centered bipyramids $M(c, i)$ and $M(c, i+1)$ correspond to the intervals $(i, i+1)$ and $(i+1, i+2)$. If s is the strand at level $i+1$ that lies between the two bipyramids, then the intervals (l_j, l_{j+1}) defined by the heights of neighboring strands in the crossing will span and contribute tetrahedra

to either both $(i, i+1)$ and $(i+1, i+2)$ or neither, unless either $l_j = i+1$ or $l_{j+1} = i+1$, which occurs when one of these neighboring strands is s . In this case, the difference between $M(c, i)$ and $M(c, i+1)$ is determined by allocation of the tetrahedra from the four faces about c that are bordered by s . If the levels of the strands to either side of s are both less than $i+1$, then the four faces will contribute 4 bipyramids to the first bipyramid and none to the second, and $M(c, i) = M(c, i+1) + 4$. If both levels are greater than $i+1$, then these four tetrahedra will be allocated to the second bipyramid, and $M(c, i) = M(c, i+1) - 4$. If one level is greater and one is less than $i+1$, then the contributions to the two bipyramids will be the same, and $M(c, i) = M(c, i+1)$. $\square$

Theorem 4. *Every sequence $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_{n-1}$ of positive integers such that $|m_i - m_{i+1}| = 0$ or 4 and $m_1 = m_{n-1} = 4$ is realized as the signature of crossing-centered bipyramid sizes for some n -crossing.*

Proof. Let the desired sequence of bipyramid sizes be $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_{n-1}$; we will construct a sequence of levels $l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n$ for strands in a multi-crossing c for which the derived crossing-centered bipyramid sizes match this sequence. The algorithm is as follows: start with $l_1 = 1$, and choose the subsequent levels greedily, such that the span that each creates is as large as possible without either contributing too many tetrahedra to a bipyramid nor “isolating” bipyramids at some level such that the level of the current strand cannot return to their level to fill them without contributing too many tetrahedra to some intermediate bipyramid. The correctness of this algorithm follows by induction: for the base case, given any sequence of $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_{n-1} = 4, 4, \dots, 4$, choose $l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Then given any legal sequence of maximum bipyramid size h , begin by sequentially choosing the smallest and largest strand levels that do not overfill any bipyramids.

In the case that there are two or more adjacent equal sizes in the bipyramid size sequence, include all but the first of the sequence according to their order of first traversal. Since the strand levels that occur between them have now been included in the permutation of the multi-crossing in such a way that the contributions to each are equal, no other strands can cause a difference in their sizes (as in the equal case in Corollary 3). This allows these bipyramids to be effectively considered as a single bipyramid in subsequent stages of the algorithm. For example, for a bipyramid size sequence of the form $4, 4, 8, \dots, 8, 4$, this choice of levels would be $1, 2, 4, 5, \dots, n-3, n-2, n, 3, n-1$. Continue until there are one or more “splitting” bipyramids, for which choosing the next element in this sequence would both fill the bipyramid and render a region of as-yet-unfilled bipyramids to be unreachable without overfilling the splitting. The sequences of unfilled bipyramids that these splitting bipyramids separate can be considered as independent sub-problems of height strictly less than h , where the desired sizes of the bipyramids in the sub-problem are the number of as-yet-uncontributed tetrahedra in the bipyramids in the original problem. By the inductive hypothesis the sub-problems have solutions, and these solutions can then be recombined with the already established levels. Since the sub-problems precisely fill each bipyramid they are given, and the sizes of their bipyramids are defined to be the number of tetrahedra that each original bipyramid lacks, this proves the correctness of the construction. $\square$




FIGURE 5. The 3-crossing crossing-centered decomposition of a link complement.

This crossing-centered bipyramid decomposition agrees with the construction used in [1] Theorem 5.2, which shows that for a link L in a 3-crossing projection, the complement can be decomposed into pairs of octahedra positioned between the strands of each 3-crossing, as in Figure 5.

3. HYPERBOLIC VOLUME BOUNDS

In hyperbolic space H^3 , for a fixed n there exists a maximum n -bipyramid volume. Therefore, given a decomposition of the link complement $S^3 \setminus L$ into bipyramids, the volume of the entire manifold $S^3 \setminus L$ is bounded above by the sum of the maximum possible volumes of its constituent bipyramids. We pursue this strategy in order to develop upper bounds for volumes of hyperbolic link complements, given their multi-crossing projections and the corresponding bipyramid decompositions developed in Section 2. To begin, we know from [4] Theorem 2.2 that these maximum bipyramid volumes grow logarithmically in n :

Theorem 5. $\text{vol}(B_n) < 2\pi \log(n/2)$ for $n \geq 3$ and $\text{vol}(B_n)$ grows asymptotically like $2\pi \log(n/2)$:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{vol}(B_n)}{2\pi \log(n/2)} = 1.$$

In a subsequent paper, we will explore the volume bounds to which these decompositions give rise and consider techniques for improving upon these bounds.

For the purposes of this paper, we note that the multi-crossing-centered bipyramid decomposition for a hyperbolic link L , in a projection with multi-crossings C , gives a strict upper bound on the volume of L . This bound is

$$(3) \quad \text{vol}(L) < \sum_{c \in C} \sum_{i=1}^{n(c)-1} \text{vol}(B_{c,i}),$$

where $n(c)$ is the number of strands in multi-crossing c , and $B_{c,i}$ is the ideal regular bipyramid of size $M(c,i)$, as defined in Theorem 2. This multi-crossing crossing-centered bipyramid bound will be referred to as the MCCB bound on volume.

Similarly, the multi-crossing face-centered bipyramid decomposition also gives us a bound. If F is the set faces in a given multi-crossing projection of L , and B_f is the bipyramid centered at the face f in the face-centered bipyramid deconstruction derived from this projection, then

$$(4) \quad \text{vol}(L) < \sum_{f \in F} \text{vol}(B_f),$$

where the size of B_f is given by Theorem 1. This multi-crossing face-centered bipyramid bound will be referred to at the MFCB bound on volume.

Note that for both the face-centered and crossing-centered bipyramid decompositions, the specific configuration of the n -multicrossings affect the sizes of the bipyramids, and therefore the MCCB and MFCB bounds. Certain crossing permutations yield larger volumes and volume upper bounds than others. This variation will be investigated further in the subsequent paper.

4. MAXIMAL WEAVES

In [7] Champanerker, Kofman, and Purcell introduced the *infinite weave* $\mathcal{W}$, which is the unique infinite alternating link embedded in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with the (4^4) regular tiling of the Euclidean plane as its projection graph as in Figure 6(A). They also study the *volume density* of hyperbolic links, which is defined for a link L to be

$$(5) \quad \mathcal{D}_{\text{vol}}(L) = \frac{\text{vol}(L)}{c(L)},$$

and they considered $\mathcal{W}$ as the limit of an infinite sequence of links that contain increasingly large patches of the square weave.

In this manner, they showed that $\mathcal{W}$ is *geometrically maximal*, meaning that in the limit it attains the maximal value of $\mathcal{D}_{\text{vol}}(\mathcal{W}) = v_{\text{oct}}$, which realizes D. Thurston's octahedral upper bound on volume. Since each face of $\mathcal{W}$ has 4 sides, it also realizes the face-centered bipyramid upper bound of [4].




FIGURE 6. Three weaves.

We now apply these new decompositions and corresponding volume upper bounds to the *triple weave* $\mathcal{W}_T$ corresponding to the (3^6) regular tiling shown in Figure 6(B) and the *isocles right triangle weave* $\mathcal{W}_R$, corresponding to the $[4.8^2]$ Laves tiling,

shown in Figure 6(C). These are periodic infinite links embedded in $\mathbb{R}^3$. The triple weave has triple crossings of type 123 and 132 in alternate rows. The right triangle weave has an equal ratio of 2-crossings and 4-crossings, with 4-crossings given by the permutation 1243, where the top strand in the 4-crossing passes through the 2-crossing as an understrand and the bottom strand in the 4-crossing passes through the 2-crossing as an overstrand.

For all three weaves, we can take the quotient of $\mathbb{R}^3$ by $\mathbb{Z}^2$, its discrete subgroup of translational isometries to obtain a link in a thickened torus $T \times (0, 1)$. Equivalently, we can think of this as a link in S^3 , where we have added two components, each of which is a core curve of one of the solid tori to either side of the projection torus, so the complement of these two components is $T \times (0, 1)$.

For the square weave, we denote this link complement in S^3 by $\mathcal{W}'$. There are four 2-crossings on the projection torus and the projection is alternating on the torus, which is apparent from Figure 7(A). The core curves of the solid torus are shown in pink and light blue. The four link components of the square weave each bound a twice-punctured disk in the complement, and two of these twice-punctured disks are shown here in green.

For the triple weave, we denote the link complement by $\mathcal{W}'_T$. There are two 3-crossings on the torus, as in Figure 7(B). And for the isosceles right triangle weave, the corresponding link complement of which is denoted $\mathcal{W}'_R$, there is a single 2-crossing and a single 4-crossing on the torus as in Figure 7(C).


Theorem 6. $\mathcal{W}'$, $\mathcal{W}'_T$ and $\mathcal{W}'_R$ are all isometric with volume equal to $4v_{oct}$.

Proof. By cutting $\mathcal{W}'$ open along the two thrice-punctured spheres highlighted in Figure 7(A), introducing a full twist on each, and regluing them, we obtain $\mathcal{W}'_T$, as shown in Figure 7(B). The resulting manifold is isometric to the original and therefore has the same volume.


Similarly, introducing a full twist to each of the thrice-punctured spheres highlighted in Figure 7(C) yields $\mathcal{W}'_R$ as shown in Figure 7(D). Therefore all three are isometric. Using either results of [7] as applied to $\mathcal{W}'$ or using the decomposition of any of these link complements into four ideal octahedra meeting four along each edge yields a volume, via the Mostow/Prasad Rigidity Theorem, of $4v_{oct}$. $\square$

The volume of this shared manifold achieves both the MFCB bound and MCCB bound in all three cases. In the case of $\mathcal{W}'$, there is one ideal regular octahedron corresponding to each of the crossings of the link in $T \times (0, 1)$. In the case of $\mathcal{W}'_T$, there are two regular ideal octahedra at each of the two triple crossings in $T \times (0, 1)$. In the case of $\mathcal{W}'_R$, there is one ideal regular octahedron at the 2-crossing and three octahedra at the single 1243-crossing in $T \times (0, 1)$. We could also consider the bipyramids coming from the faces of the projection onto the torus, and we obtain one regular ideal octahedron per face for the four faces, in each of these three cases, again realizing the upper bound on volume. Note that we had to remove additional link components to put us in $T \times (0, 1)$, which makes all vertices ideal on the octahedra, which is necessary in order to realize the upper bounds on volume.


Corollary 7. $\mathcal{W}_T$ is geometrically maximal among all 3-crossing links in $T \times (0, 1)$.




(A) The link complement $\mathcal{W}'$, with a pair of twice-punctured disks highlighted.



(B) The link $\mathcal{W}'_T$ on the torus, derived from Figure 7(A).



(C) The link complement $\mathcal{W}'$ with a different pair of twice-punctured disks highlighted.



(D) The link $\mathcal{W}'_R$ on the torus, derived from Figure 7(C).

FIGURE 7. On the left, two pairs of twice-punctured disks in the complement of $\mathcal{W}'$. The core curves are shown in pink and blue. On the right, the representations of $\mathcal{W}'_T$ and $\mathcal{W}'_R$ generated by cutting open, twisting full twists and regluing on these pairs of disks.

Proof. From the preceding theorem, $\text{vol}(\mathcal{W}_T) = 4v_{oct}$. Since it consists of two 3-crossings on the torus, this implies that the *triple volume density* of $\mathcal{W}_T$ is

$$(6) \quad \mathcal{D}_{vol}^3(\mathcal{W}_T) = \frac{\text{vol}(\mathcal{W}_T)}{c_3(\mathcal{W}_T)} = 2v_{oct}$$

This also realizes the MCCB bound for 3-crossings in general, where the region surrounding each 3-crossing can be decomposed into two octahedra. In the specific configuration of $\mathcal{W}_T$, the FCCB bound is also realized, because the face-centered bipyramids are also octahedra and there are two faces per crossing. From the MCCB bound it follows that no link embedded in $T \times (0, 1)$ can have a higher 3-crossing volume density. $\square$

For finite links with 3-crossing planar projections in S^3 , the MCCB bound of $2v_{oct}$ per crossing given by [1] (and the equivalent decomposition above) certainly holds. However volume bound improvements can be made by collapsing the finite u and d vertices to the cusp, so equality is unattainable. In [7] Champanerkar, Kofman, and Purcell were able to show that certain sequences of finite links that contain ever-increasing patches of the square weave also approach the infinite square weave in volume density. Their argument used lower bounds on volume attained by guts, which were derived from the essentiality of the checkerboard surfaces that came from the alternating projections that they considered. We expect analogous sequences of finite links containing increasing patches of the triple weave to similarly approach $\mathcal{D}_{vol}^3(\mathcal{W}_T) = 2v_{oct}$ in triple volume density, but the corresponding theory for links in triple-crossing projections is not yet developed enough to permit a similar argument.

More generally, we conjecture that there exist links that approach this upper bound in triple volume density:

Conjecture 1. *For links L in a 3-crossing projection on the plane, the triple volume density bound*

$$\mathcal{D}_{vol}^3(L) < 2v_{oct}$$

is sharp.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Adams. Triple crossing number of knots and links. *Journal of Knot Theory and Its Ramifications*, 22(02):1350006, 2013.
- [2] C. Adams, O. Capovilla-Searle, J. Freeman, D. Irvine, S. Petti, D. Vitek, A. Weber, and S. Zhang. Multi-crossing Number for Knots and the Kauffman Bracket Polynomial. *ArXiv 1407.4485*, July 2014.
- [3] Colin Adams. Quadruple crossing number of knots and links. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 156:241–253, 3 2014.
- [4] Colin Adams. Bipyramids and bounds on volumes of hyperbolic links. *ArXiv 1511.02372*, pages 1–17, November 2015.
- [5] Colin Adams, Orsola Capovilla-Searle, Jesse Freeman, Daniel Irvine, Samantha Petti, Daniel Vitek, Ashley Weber, and Sicong Zhang. Bounds on bccrossing and petal numbers for knots. *Journal of Knot Theory and Its Ramifications*, 24(02):1550012, 2015.
- [6] Colin Adams, Thomas Crawford, Benjamin DeMeo, Michael Landry, Alex Tong Lin, MurphyKate Montee, Seojung Park, Saraswathi Venkatesh, and Farrah Yhee. Knot projections with a single multi-crossing. *Journal of Knot Theory and Its Ramifications*, 24(03):1550011, 2015.
- [7] A. Champanerkar, I. Kofman, and J. S. Purcell. Geometrically and diagrammatically maximal knots. *ArXiv 1411.7915*, November 2014.
- [8] C. Even-Zohar, J. Hass, N. Linial, and T. Nowik. Invariants of Random Knots and Links. *ArXiv 1411.3308*, November 2014.
- [9] Stavros Garoufalidis and Thang Le. Asymptotics of the colored jones function of a knot. *Geom. Topol.*, 15(4):2135–2180, 2011.
- [10] Marc Lackenby. The volume of hyperbolic alternating link complements. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 88(1):204–224, 2004. With an appendix by Ian Agol and Dylan Thurston.
- [11] H. Murakami. Kashaev’s Invariant and the Volume of a Hyperbolic Knot after Y. Yokota. In A. N. Kirillov, A. Tsuchiya, and H. Umemura, editors, *Physics and Combinatorics*, pages 244–272, April 2001.
- [12] William Thurston. The geometry and topology of three-manifolds. Lecture Notes, 1980.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, WILLIAMS COLLEGE, WILLIAMSTOWN, MA
01267

E-mail address: `Colin.C.Adams@williams.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY, PITTSBURGH,
PA 15213

E-mail address: `gregorykehne@gmail.com`